

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of April 9, 2007 in which claims 1-31 were rejected.

It is noted that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed subsequent to the Office Action with the required certification citing a WIPO publication cited in a Korean Office Action. The Examiner is requested to consider same and to return the Form PTO-1449 to the undersigned.

In reviewing the Office Action, it is noted that claims 1, 14-16, 18-19 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hwangbo et al* (US 2003/0192061) in view of *Ericsson et al* (US 6,239,769).

Before addressing the Examiner's rejection, it might be helpful to explain the background to the invention and its advantages.

The present invention concerns facilitating delivery of a digital broadcast to a mobile terminal when (temporarily) located indoors (see page 1, line 31 to page 2, line 2). The broadcast can be a DVB-T signal and the mobile terminal can be a handheld DVB-T receiver. According to the present invention, a device is provided which has an interface adapted to receive the signal and to transmit the signal to the mobile terminal using a loop or coil. The device, even if it does not provide any active amplification itself, may provide enough gain (e.g. by virtue of bringing the signal indoors by a cable) to allow the mobile terminal to be used indoors (see page 9, lines 1-4). The device uses inductive coupling to help to minimize unnecessary (RF) retransmission which may cause interference. Inductive coupling is particularly suited when the device is arranged in the form of a cradle to hold the mobile device, for example as shown in Figure 4.

Turning now to the Examiner's reasons for rejecting claim 1:

The Examiner considers that it would be obvious to incorporate the teaching of Patent No. US 6,239,769 (*Ericcson*) into the teaching of Patent Application Publication no. US 2003/0192061 (*Hwangbo*) for the purpose of coupling signals from an outside antenna to a portable device which transmits signals inductively.

Hwangbo concerns providing a set-top box system for viewing different digital broadcast programs on many TVs by adopting one set-top box (see paragraph [0008]) and describes a system comprising one set-top box and a plurality of TVs installed in a predetermined range from several meters to tens of meters (see paragraph [0023]). The set-top box includes an RF transmitter for radio-transmitting digital broadcast data to many TVs (see paragraph [0023]).

Hwangbo does not indicate that the TVs are portable. If at all, they are likely to be **not** portable. TVs are usually large fixed not only because of their size, but also because of how they are powered.

Ericcson concerns improving connecting properties between an outside antenna and a portable telephone (see column 1, lines 46-49) and describes an antenna connector including a conductive cable and a circuit which transmits RF-signals to a main antenna of the portable telephone (see column 2, lines 24-37).

It is immediately apparent that *Hwangbo* and *Ericcson* are concerned with completely different problems and describe very different systems. There are no pointers in one reference to suggest that the other may be relevant, let alone pointers to combine the two references.

For example, in *Hwangbo*, there is evidently no problem transmitting signals from the set-top box to the TV sets.

Even if there was a problem, the person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider employing Ericsson to provide a solution since it would render *Hwangbo* unfit for its original purpose, namely simultaneous viewing of different programs in different rooms. This is because the claimed inductive coupling has a short range and so the set-top box and the TV's would need to be very closely separated, e.g. measured in terms of centimeters rather than meters.

For this reason, we submit that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider combining the references and thus arrive at the invention claimed in claim 1.

It therefore seems evident that the Examiner has viewed the references using impermissible hindsight since the references provide no suggestion for making the combination and that the combination would be unworkable and inoperative. Therefore, it is clear that claim 1 is not obvious and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection thereof is requested.

It is likewise clear, for the same reasons, that claims 18-21 and 22 are not obvious and withdrawal of the rejection thereof is requested.

Applicant submits that claims 2-17, 19-20 and 23-31 are not obvious at least by way of dependency and withdrawal of the rejections thereof is requested as well.

Applicant hereby submits a Form PTO/SB/22 Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time under 35 C.F.R. 1.36(a) as we believe an extension of time is needed. Also enclosed is our check for \$120 in payment therefor. If the amount is incorrect, or if the petition is for the incorrect period or is for some reason not included, please consider this as a petition for the correct extension of time and the Commissioner is then authorized to deduct the appropriate amount from our Deposit Account No. 23-0442.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of April 9, 2007, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-31 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234